UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,718	09/30/2003	Sankara Sastry Varanasi	50325-0820	2950

29989 7590 09/16/2009

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER
AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/676,718	VARANASI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 December 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A. This action is in response to the following communications: Request for Continued Examination filed 12/31/2008.

B. Claims 1-45 remains pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

C. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/31/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood, John et al (US 6,697,825), herein referred to as "Underwood" in view of Underwood, Roy Aaron (US Pat. 6,523,027), herein referred to as "Underwood2".

As for independent claim 1, Underwood teaches a system for generating a graphical user interface for an application program (col.4, lines 50-61), comprising: one or more business objects that define functions of the application program (col.13, lines 52-61); one or more metadata elements defining parameters for the functions of the business object (col.21, lines 5-11); a controller configured for invocation by a browser and communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets, and panels (col.41, lines 14-36); a service object manager coupled to the controller and to the business objects, and configured to supply service object parameter values from the business objects and metadata elements to the actions (col.41, lines 37-57); wherein the controller comprises logic configured to receive a user request from a user through the browser used to interact with the application program and to dispatch the user request to one or the actions, the controller determining which of the one or more actions is responsible for acting on the user request (col.42, lines 21-34); wherein the actions comprises logic

configured to interact with the business objects through service object manager to obtain service object parameter values to the actions (col.41, lines 47-53); wherein the controller comprises logic configured to associate the service object parameter values with one of the widgets, arrange the one of the widgets into a specified layout within one of the panels (col.42, lines 4-20), and to generate an HTML user interface page that includes the panel (col.42, line 18).

(Note: columns 39-44 as a simple outline of the disclosed art, further reading around the subject yield a better understanding of terms and definitions as well as practice of use.)

Underwood does not specifically teach the term “widget”, in such Underwood does not specifically teach wherein at least one of the widgets has the capability of representing properties of the business objects as HTML. Further Underwood does not specifically teach receiving one or more business objects that each defines a user action; invoking a controller that is communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets and panels; the controller determining which of the one or more actions is responsible for acting on the user request.

However in the same field of endeavor Underwood2 teaches wherein at least one of the widgets has the capability of representing properties of the business objects as HTML (at least in col.299, lines 41-47). Further Underwood2 teaches receiving one or more business objects that each defines a user action (at least in col.58, line 65 - col.59, line 15 and col.133, line 64 - col.134, line 2); invoking a controller that is

communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets and panels and the controller determining which of the one or more actions is responsible for acting on the user request (col.29,lines 43-61; col.129, lines 60-67). The combination of Underwood2 into Underwood modifies Underwood's method and apparatus with the variant options (steps) *of at least one of the widgets has the capability of representing properties of the business objects as HTML; receiving one or more business objects that each defines a user action; and invoking a controller that is communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets and panels.*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Underwood2 into Underwood, this is true because Underwood2 teaches of a method and apparatus for universal interfacing between a first server and second (web or application) server (large network) (col.2, lines 5-35); wherein Underwood teaches of a method and apparatus for universal interfacing of content for a large computing network. With both Underwood and Underwood2 teaching solutions to similar problems one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been hard pressed to see the variant additions from Underwood2 into Underwood's method and apparatus.

As for independent claims 2,13,23 and 33, Underwood teaches a method and corresponding medium and apparatus of automatically generating a consistent user interface for an application program (col.4, lines 50-61; templates user defined-

producing automatic page creation in particular layout, style, etc), the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of: receiving one or more business objects that each define a user action for the application program (col.13, lines 52-61); receiving one or more metadata elements defining parameters for the user actions of the business object (col.21, lines 5-11); invoking a controller that is communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets, and panels (col.41, lines 14-36); receiving a user request from a user through a browser used to interact with the application program and dispatching the user request to one or the actions (col.42, lines 21-34); obtaining, using the actions, one or more parameter values from the business objects (col.41, lines 47-53); associating, using the actions, the business object parameter values with a widget selected from among the one or more widgets (col.42, lines 4-20); associating the selected widget with a panel selected from the one or more panels wherein the selected widget is arranged into a specified layout within the selected panel (col.42, lines 4-20); and generating an HTML user interface page that includes the selected panel (col.42, line 18).

Underwood does not specifically teach the term “widget”, in such Underwood does not specifically teach wherein at least one of the widgets has the capability of representing properties of the business objects as HTML. Further Underwood does not specifically teach receiving one or more business objects that each defines a user action; invoking a controller that is communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets and panels;

the controller determining which of the one or more actions is responsible for acting on the user request.

However in the same field of endeavor Underwood2 teaches wherein at least one of the widgets has the capability of representing properties of the business objects as HTML (at least in col.299, lines 41-47). Further Underwood2 teaches receiving one or more business objects that each defines a user action (at least in col.58, line 65 - col.59, line 15 and col.133, line 64 - col.134, line 2); invoking a controller that is communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets and panels and the controller determining which of the one or more actions is responsible for acting on the user request (col.29,lines 43-61; col.129, lines 60-67). The combination of Underwood2 into Underwood modifies Underwood's method and apparatus with the variant options (steps) *of at least one of the widgets has the capability of representing properties of the business objects as HTML; receiving one or more business objects that each defines a user action; and invoking a controller that is communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets and panels and the controller determining which of the one or more actions is responsible for acting on the user request.*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Underwood2 into Underwood, this is true because Underwood2 teaches of a method and apparatus for universal interfacing between a first server and second (web or application) server (large network) (col.2, lines 5-35); wherein Underwood teaches of

a method and apparatus for universal interfacing of content for a large computing network. With both Underwood and Underwood2 teaching solutions to similar problems one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been hard pressed to see the variant additions from Underwood2 into Underwood's method and apparatus.

As for dependent claims 3-11, 13-22, 24-32 and 34-42, Underwood teaches a method and corresponding medium and apparatus as recited in Claims 2,13,23,and 33.

As for claim 3, 13 and 34 Underwood further teaches wherein the business object parameters are associated with one of the widgets based on the user request (col.16, lines 6-33).

As for claim 4, 14 and 35, Underwood further teaches wherein the application program is a network management application program (col.42, lines 54-67 and col.43, lines 1-13).

As for claim 5, 15 and 36, Underwood further teaches wherein receiving one or more business objects that define functions of the application program comprises receiving an XML file that defines the business objects and one or more of the parameters for the business objects (col.49, lines 4-20).

As for claim 6, 16 and 37, Underwood further teaches further comprising the step of generating, using the widget, client-side executable program code that performs one or more data validation or access control operations on user input for the user operation (col.39, lines 64-67 and col.40, lines 1-21).

As for claim 7, 17 and 38, Underwood further teaches wherein the step of receiving a user request comprises receiving a user request from the browser and dispatching the user request to one or the actions, wherein the actions interact with the business objects through service object module interfaces that provide parameter values for the business objects to the actions (col.41, lines 37-57 and col.42, lines 21-34).

As for claim 8, 18 and 39, Underwood further teaches receiving user input in a field of the user interface that is associated with the widget, wherein the user input is received in HTML elements of an HTTP request from a browser (col.39, lines 56-67 and col.40, lines 1-10 and col.42, lines 21-34);converting the user input from the HTML elements into one or more programmatic objects having an appropriate data type for use by the application program (col.39, lines 56-67 and col.40, lines 1-10 and col.42, lines 21-34).

As for claim 9, 19 and 40, Underwood further teaches further comprising the step of associating a first widget with a second widget, wherein the first widget and second widget are related by a containment hierarchy (figure 54).

As for claim 10, 20 and 41, Underwood further teaches wherein each of the widgets represents one or more properties of the business objects by an HTML element (col.46, lines 1-6).

As for claim 11, 21 and 42, Underwood further teaches wherein the step of generating an HTML user interface page that includes the panel further comprises generating an HTML user interface page that includes one or more of JSP files, static HTML elements, style sheets, or images (col.48, lines 12-14 and 23).

Underwood does not specifically teach the term "widget". However in the same field of endeavor Underwood2 the use of widgets (at least in par.256 and 3076). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Underwood2 into Underwood, this is true because Underwood2 teaches a system that allows a user to create dynamic web pages with Java, thus the use of widgets in a similar system of Underwood would be an obvious variant and would yield the predictable result of having the ability available to a user of the development system to have access to widgets that represent properties of business objects as HTML when creating dynamic web pages that in the end result have a consistent user interface (look and feel throughout the entire web site).

As for independent claim 12, Underwood teaches a method of automatically generating a consistent user interface for a network

management application program (col.4, lines 50-61; note that "for a network management application program" is intended use), the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of: receiving one or more definitions of service objects, wherein each definition specifies a user action for the network management application program (col.42,lines 4-34); receiving one or more metadata elements defining parameters for the user actions of the service objects (note the analysis of claims 1-2); invoking a controller that is communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets, and panels(note the analysis of claims 1-2); receiving a user request from the browser and dispatching the user request to one or the actions(note the analysis of claims 1-2); obtaining one or more parameter values from the service objects by interaction of the actions with service object model interfaces that are implemented by the service objects (note the analysis of claims 1-2); associating the service object parameter values with a widget selected from among the one or more widgets(note the analysis of claim 2); associating the selected widget with a panel selected from the one or more panels(note the analysis of claim 2); and generating an HTML user interface page that includes the selected panel(note the analysis of claim 2).

Underwood does not specifically teach the term "widget", in such Underwood does not specifically teach wherein at least one of the widgets has the capability of representing properties of the business objects as HTML. Further Underwood does not specifically teach receiving one or more business objects that each defines a user action; invoking a controller that is communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets and panels;

the controller determining which of the one or more actions is responsible for acting on the user request.

However in the same field of endeavor Underwood2 teaches wherein at least one of the widgets has the capability of representing properties of the business objects as HTML (at least in col.299, lines 41-47). Further Underwood2 teaches receiving one or more business objects that each defines a user action (at least in col.58, line 65 - col.59, line 15 and col.133, line 64 - col.134, line 2); invoking a controller that is communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets and panels and the controller determining which of the one or more actions is responsible for acting on the user request (col.29,lines 43-61; col.129, lines 60-67). The combination of Underwood2 into Underwood modifies Underwood's method and apparatus with the variant options (steps) *of at least one of the widgets has the capability of representing properties of the business objects as HTML; receiving one or more business objects that each defines a user action; and invoking a controller that is communicatively coupled to one or more actions, widgets and panels and the controller determining which of the one or more actions is responsible for acting on the user reques*t.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Underwood2 into Underwood, this is true because Underwood2 teaches of a method and apparatus for universal interfacing between a first server and second (web or application) server (large network) (col.2, lines 5-35); wherein Underwood teaches of a method and apparatus for universal interfacing of content for a large computing network. With both Underwood and Underwood2 teaching solutions to similar problems

one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been hard pressed to see the variant additions from Underwood2 into Underwood's method and apparatus.

As for dependent claims 43-45, Underwood teaches the system of claim 1 above.

Underwood does not specifically teach the term “widget”, in such Underwood does not specifically teach wherein one or more of the widgets are capable of automatically generate executable code, performing data validation or be arranged into a panel class.

However in the same field of endeavor Underwood2 teaches wherein at least one of the widgets has the capability of representing properties of the business objects as HTML (at least in col.299, lines 41-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Underwood2 into Underwood, this is true because Underwood2 teaches of a method and apparatus for universal interfacing between a first server and second (web or application) server (large network) (col.2, lines 5-35); wherein Underwood teaches of a method and apparatus for universal interfacing of content for a large computing network. With both Underwood and Underwood2 teaching solutions to similar problems one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been hard pressed to see the variant additions from Underwood2 into Underwood's method and apparatus.

(Note :) **It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).**

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/31/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056 and fax is 571-270-2056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 9:30am- 5:00pm Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
September 9, 2009

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179